

Cedar River Anadromous Fish Committee

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES - Summary Version

April 19, 2001

**Metering Building, Second Floor Conference Room
SPU Operations Control Center
2700 Airport Way S., Seattle**

Members Present: Bruce Bachen (SPU), Frank Urabeck (NWMTA), Tom Sibley (NMFS), Gwill Ging (USFWS), Ron Warren, Steve Foley (WDFW), Dennis Moore, Eric Warner (MIT), Sam Wright, Nick Gayeski (Washington Trout), Bill Robinson (Trout Unlimited), Scott Brewer (King County), Dave Paden (Puget Sound Anglers)

Other Participants: Linda De Boldt, Bill Wells, Cyndy Holtz (SPU)

- I. Call to order** – Bruce called the meeting to order at 9:00.
- II. Approval of agenda** – The agenda was approved as submitted.
- III. Minutes review and approval for March 15, 2001 meeting** – There were several corrections to the minutes, which were noted for incorporation into the final minutes. Members were asked to review the final version to insure the corrections were properly made.
- IV. Fish Passage Update – Bill Wells, Project Manager**
Bill Wells gave a status report on the project. The basis of design report has been distributed to involved agencies, and a SEPA checklist provided to agencies and interested parties. Comments are due May 4. Construction is scheduled to begin in spring, 2002. Discussion focussed on the cost estimate and project budget differences, and options under consideration which were identified in the recent value engineering exercise to reduce projected costs. Most discussion focussed on relocating the screen and alternatives for fish sorting.
- V. Discussion of adaptive management**
SPU and Washington Trout collaborated with the Society for Ecological Restoration (SER) to conduct an Adaptive Management Roundtable Discussion and follow-up Plenary Session Panel Discussion at SER's biannual conference, held in Bellevue in March. Nick Gayeski of Washington Trout, and Linda De Boldt, SPU, reported on what was learned at the conference about adaptive management that would be applicable and pertinent to development of the Sockeye Hatchery Adaptive Management Plan. The main points gleaned from the conference included the need for a strategic, organizational framework for decision-making; the importance of considering the political pressures that drive policy decisions; and the need to improve the exchange of information between decision-makers and scientists. Some of the general results of these discussions will be used in the development of the hatchery adaptive management plan.

VI. Interim mitigation for coho, chinook and steelhead

A. Draft response letter to WDFW concerning assistance request with steelhead project

Earlier this year WDFW approached the AFC with a request for HCP funding assistance for its steelhead collection program at the locks. Since the original request, WDFW identified an alternative funding source and withdrew its request. A letter was drafted for the AFC to WDFW explaining that the AFC did not take action on the request after it was explained that WDFW was no longer requesting funding. The letter also explained that the AFC is considering an approach for funding future proposals that address Interim Mitigation for coho, chinook and steelhead. The committee recommended that the letter be sent describing the process that will be used.

B. Proposed approach for program implementation.

In an effort to initiate implementation of the Interim Mitigation program, Bruce Bachen proposed to the committee that it issue an RFP to interested parties for submittal of proposals for projects and activities that would address the interim mitigation goals of the LMA. The AFC discussion centered on whether an RFP process should be initiated at this time given that the co-managers (WDFW and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe) are discussing supplementation out of concern over recent return levels of chinook salmon. The interim mitigation provision in the Landsburg Mitigation Agreement under the HCP identifies not only supplementation, but research as means by which interim mitigation could be achieved, so there is potential opportunity for non-supplementation proposals to be received. Some members felt that emergency supplementation is needed. There was acknowledgement that the Parties may not be able to agree on whether Interim mitigation funding should be spent on supplementation. Therefore, the committee agreed to delay consideration of any supplementation proposals not submitted by the co-managers until the end of three months. At the end of three months, the committee may consider other proposals for interim mitigation, which may include research as well as emergency supplementation.

MOTION: Frank motioned that the AFC not consider or act on any other proposals for the interim mitigation funding except those dealing with chinook, steelhead and coho supplementation until the end of the three month period. Tom seconded the motion.

VOTE: Carried unanimously.

VII. Initiation of Cedar River sockeye hatchery program development

Bruce Bachen briefed the committee on the project initiation meeting that is being planned to provide the hatchery project design team led by Tetra Tech/KCM, the design consultant, with background on the hatchery project. The meeting would be attended by AFC member organization representatives, key members of the Tetra Tech/KCM design team, and SPU staff. The meeting would provide those with close involvement in the hatchery project to share their perspectives with the design team

and others. There would also be an opportunity for the Science Panel to present their Guiding Principles Report to both the AFC and the design team. The last part of the meeting would focus on the process that will be used to develop the hatchery program elements required in the HCP and include how input and decisions will be made. A draft list of background materials to be provided to the design team was handed out to the committee for its review and input. The report on the broodstock collection report was postponed until the May meeting.

VIII. Public comment (scheduled for 11:30)

IX. Information/discussion

1. Hatchery status report – Ron Warren – Ron handed out a report on hatchery operations in 2000 and summarized it for the committee. The report included rack data, rack management logs, rack passage opportunity, eggtake data and release data for Brood Year 2000. Bruce mentioned that they still need to complete the evaluation of the weir protocols and asked how they would go about reviewing the report on weir protocols. Last year the technical committee reviewed it. Steve stated that last year it was sent to NMFS. Frank agreed that this year's report should go to NMFS. Frank noted that they reported compliance with the weir protocols last year. Ron offered to take the lead for producing the report and felt that the AFC should review it before it is sent to NMFS.
2. Cedar River report – Steve Foley – Steve reported on steelhead surveys. They only have a few redds so far. It looks consistent with what they are seeing at the locks. Numbers of fish at the counter will probably be the same or higher than last year (January 15 through May 15). Probably 50 to 100 fish for escapement this year. They have collected one steelhead at the locks (since April 2nd). This is the lowest flow they have had for the five years they have been counting.
3. Limnology research contract – Bruce explained that they just signed a contract for “Investigations of Factors Influencing Sockeye Growth and Survival in Lake Washington,” with Dave Beauchamp and Dan Schindler. It will provide new data on growth over the summer rearing period and estimate smelt populations in the lake. Frank asked how this information will be used? Bruce replied it is an important data point with the high numbers of sockeye entering the lake this year. Tom suggested it would be more important to look at growth next spring since the pressure from the abundant fry that entered the lake in 2001 will be high and plankton populations could be grazed more heavily than normal. Eric felt that the fall data were not as important since so many sockeye leave the lake as Age zero smolts.

X. Plan next agenda for meeting scheduled for May 17, 2001

XI. Adjourn – Meeting was adjourned at 1:05.